



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, May 6, 1902.

MR. R. L. MOORE, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

MY DEAR MR. MOORE: I read with much interest, the other day, your proof of the redundancy of Hilbert's axiom II 4, in his system I, II, as exhibited by Professor Halsted in the current number of the *AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL MONTHLY*. Today I received from Professor Halsted a copy of that number. This is in response to a letter I sent him a week or so ago stating that I should be pleased to receive for publication in the *Transactions* the delightfully simple proof of the redundancy of which he wrote [had written] to me. I certainly agree with him in this estimate of your proof. Apparently he has not called your attention to the fact that the redundancy was pointed out by me and proved in my paper, which I am sending under separate cover, on the projective axioms of geometry, published in the January number of the *Transactions*. In accordance with correspondence with him, it was in connection with this paper of mine that he wrote to Hilbert and received Hilbert's response which led to your work on the subject. You will see that it was my desire to survey the whole system of projective axioms, and to exhibit a new system, and, in that connection to show that Hilbert's axioms I 4 and II 4 were in his system redundant, and, moreover, to furnish a satisfactory account of the rôles of the axioms I 3, 4, 5 which had been held by Schur to be redundant. As to the axiom II 4, you will see that, by considerations of the other linear axioms alone, and so in particular without the use of II 5, or of my axiom 4, I prove on page 151 that the axiom II 4 is a result of the statement 2₁, which [statement] is the statement of your theorem I. Thus to complete the proof of the redundancy of II 4, in Hilbert's system, I should today make use of your proof of theorem I. The proof that I give, in that it involves my triangle transversal axiom 4, is necessarily much longer.

I have supposed that you might be interested in understanding how your paper impresses me, and remain with considerable interest in the progress of your mathematical career,

Yours very truly,

(Signed) E. H. MOORE.

I suppose that the letter as a whole may be of value and interest to some readers of *THE MONTHLY*.

Chicago, June 3, 1902.

A NON-EUCLIDEAN GEM.

By DR. GEORGE BRUCE HALSTED.

La Géométrie non-euclidienne. Par P. Barbarin. Paris, C. Naud. 1902.

It is peculiarly appropriate that from Bordeaux, made sacred for non-Euclidean geometry by Hoüel, should emanate this beautiful little treatise, decor-

ated with a 'gravure' reproducing part of a manuscript of Euclid, also with the 'official' portrait of Lobachevski, but best of all with a portrait of Riemann.

It begins from the hackneyed position: "Experience therefore it is which has furnished to the ancient geometers a certain number of primitive notions, of axioms, or fundamental postulates put by them at the basis of the science."

But now we know there never was any pure receptivity. In all thinking enters a creative element. Every bit of experience is in part created by the subject said to receive it, but really in great part making it.

Professor Barbarin continues: "From the epoch of Euclid, this number has been reduced to the strict minimum necessary, and all the others not comprised in this list, being capable of demonstration, are put in the class of theorems." Now we know that Euclid omits to notice many of the assumptions he unconsciously employs, for example all the "betweenness assumptions," while Hilbert has at last rigorously demonstrated Euclid's assumption, "All right angles are equal," and in turn one of Hilbert's assumptions has just been proven (see *AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL MONTHLY*, April, 1902, pp. 98-101).

The 'Elements' of Euclid, says Professor Barbarin, enjoyed throughout all the middle ages and still enjoy a celebrity that no other work of science has attained; this celebrity is due to their logical perfection, to the admirable concatenation of the propositions, and to the rigor of the demonstrations.

"Il mit dans son livre," says Montucla, "cet enchaînement si admiré par les amateurs de la rigueur géométrique." "In vain," he adds, "divers geometers whom this arrangement has displeased, have attempted to better it. Their vain efforts have made clear how difficult it is to substitute for the chain made by the Greek geometer another as firm and as solid." 'This opinion of the historian of mathematics,' says our author, 'retains all its value even after the researches which geometers have undertaken for about a century to submit the fundamental principles of the science to an acute and profound examination.'

I add that the remarkable discoveries of Dehn (see *Science*, N. S., Vol. XIV, pp. 711, 712), prove an unexpected superiority for Euclid over all successors down to our very day, and suggest the latest advance, which, though as yet unpublished, exists, for under date of April 2, 1902, Hilbert writes me: "In einer andern Arbeit will ich die Lobatschewski'sche Geometrie in der Ebene unabhängig von Archimedes begründen." That is, Hilbert will found Bolyai's geometry as he has Euclid's, without any continuity assumption. To get the benefit of this brilliant achievement, I am holding back my own book on this fascinating subject.

Says Hilbert in his unpublished *Vorlesung ueber Euklidische Geometrie*, "The order of propositions is important. Mine differs strongly from that usual in text books of elementary geometry; on the other hand, it greatly agrees with Euclid's order.

"So fuehren uns diese ganz modernen Untersuchungen dazu, den Scharfsinn dieses alten Mathematikers recht zu wuerdigen und aufs hoechst zu bewundern."

Again, *apropos* of Euclid's renowned parallel postulate, Hilbert says: "What sagacity, what penetration the setting up of this axiom required we best recognize if we look at the history of the axiom of parallels. As to Euclid himself (circa 300 B. C.) he, *e. g.*, proves the theorem of the exterior angle before introducing the parallel axiom, a sign how deeply he had penetrated in *den Zusammenhang der geometrischen Sätze*."

Professor Barbarin repeats the exploded error of attributing to Gauss the discovery of the non-Euclidean geometry in 1792. In the introduction to my translation of Bolyai's 'Science Absolute of Space,' pp. viii-ix, is a letter from Gauss, on which I there remark: "From this letter we clearly see that in 1799 Gauss was still trying to prove that Euclid's is the only non-contradictory system of geometry, and that it is the system regnant in the external space of our physical experience. The first is false; the second can never be proven." In 1804 Gauss writes that in vain he still seeks the unloosing of this Gordian knot.

Again, with the date April 27, 1813, we read: "In the theory of parallels we are even now not farther than Euclid was. This is the '*partie hortense*' (shameful part) of mathematics, which soon or late must receive a wholly different form. Thus in 1813 there is in Göttingen still no light.

But in 1812 in Charkow, the non-Euclidean geometry already had been for the first time consciously created by Schweikart, whose summary characterization of it is given in *Science*, N. S., Vol. XII, pp. 842-846. This he communicated to Bessel and sent to Gerling and afterward to Gauss in 1818, so that it may claim to be the first *published* (not printed) treatise on non-Euclidean geometry. By this time Gauss had progressed far enough to be willing to signify *privately* his acceptance of Schweikart's doctrines.

On p. 15 Barbarin makes a brief argument for Euclid's axiom, "All right angles are equal." This argument was good before Hilbert and Veronese, since this axiom can never be proved by superposition. It is already a consequence of the assumptions preliminary to motion. This profounder analysis Barbarin has not attained to. He still uses as a postulate and supposes indispensable "*l'indéformabilité des figures en déplacement*." What Tules Andrade calls '*cette malheureuse et illogique définition*' of Legendre, 'the shortest path between two points is a straight line,' Barbarin puts as an elementary proposition! Manning also, p. 2, assumes it, thus invalidating and making ephemeral his pretty little "Non-Euclidean Geometry" (Ginn & Co., 1901). Barbarin then proceeds to classify geometries by Saccheri's three hypotheses, the hypothesis of obtuse angle, the hypothesis of right angle, the hypothesis of acute angle, or that the angle sum of a rectilinear triangle is greater than, equal to, less than two right angles. But the remarkable discoveries of Dehn have now shown that this classification is invalid.

Barbarin says, p. 16, 'Saccheri proves that the hypothesis of the obtuse angle is incompatible with postulate 6' of Euclid. Dehn dissipates this supposed incompatibility by actually exhibiting a new geometry in which they amicably blend, which he calls the non-Legendrean geometry. In the same way,

the hypothesis of right angle amalgamates with the contradiction of Euclid's parallel-postulate in a geometry which Dehn calls semi-Euclidean. As Dehn states this result: There are non-Archimedean geometries in which the parallel-axiom is not valid and yet the angle-sum in every triangle is equal to two right angles. Thus the Theorem (Legendre, 12th Ed., I, 23; Barbarin, p. 25): 'If the sum of the angles of every triangle is equal to two right angles, the fifth postulate is true,' is seen to break down.

Manning's 'Non-Euclidean Geometry,' though it says (p. 93), 'The elliptic geometry was left to be discovered by Riemann,' gives only the single elliptic. It never even mentions the double elliptic, or spherical or Riemannian geometry, which Killing maintains was the only form which ever came before Riemann's mind. If so, then Barbarin's book is like Riemann's mind. The Riemannian, as distinguished from the single elliptic, is the only form which appears in it. Killing was the first, who (1879, *Crelle's Journal*, Bd. 83) made clear the difference between the Riemannian and the single elliptic space (or as he calls it, the polar form of the Riemannian).

Klein championed the single elliptic. Manning knows no other. Professor Simon Newcomb, like Manning, deals only with the single elliptic in his treatise; 'Elementary theorems relating to the geometry of a space of three dimensions and of uniform positive curvature in the fourth dimension.' The last four words F. S. Woods replaces by seven dots in his article 'Space of constant curvature' (*Annals of Math.*, Vol. 3, p. 72), though blaming Professor E. S. Crawley for the error they contain. Newcomb's also was the unfortunate statement which dubbed this "A Fairytale of Geometry," a point of view from which he is still suffering in his latest little unburdening in *Harper's Magazine*. Just so Lobachevski had the misfortune to call his creation "Imaginary Geometry." Contrast John Bolyai's "The Science Absolute of Space."

In single elliptic space every complete straight line is of finite constant length πk . Every pair of straight lines intersect and return again to their point of intersection, but have no other point in common. In the so-called spherical space, that is the Riemannian space, two straight lines always meet in two points (opposites, or antipodal points,) which are πk from each other. The single elliptic makes the plane a unilateral or double surface, so that two antipodal points would correspond to one point, but to opposite sides of this one-sided plane with reference to surrounding three-dimensional elliptic space.

The geometry for two-dimensional Riemannian space coincides completely with pure spherics, that is, with spherics established from postulates which make no reference to anything off of the sphere, inside or outside the sphere. Hence the great desirability of a treatise on pure spherics. It would at the same time be true and available for Euclidean and for Riemannian geometry. Yet its relations to three-dimensional Euclidean and three-dimensional Riemannian space would differ radically.

Through every Riemannian straight line passes an infinity of planes also Riemannian, and in each of these this straight has a determined and distinct

center; but the straight is independent of the planes, and is defined by the postulates. Now in the sphere the great circle and the one *pseudo*-plane which contains and fixes it, namely the sphere, are inseparable, since any portion, however minute, of either determines all the other as well as its center and radius.

In the single elliptic geometry the elliptic straight line does not divide the elliptic plane into two separated regions. We can pass from any one point of the plane to any other point without crossing a given straight in it. Starting from the point of intersection of two straights and passing along one of them a certain finite length, we come to the intersection point again without having crossed the other straight. Hence we can pass from what seems one side of the straight line to what seems the other without crossing it, that is, it is uni-lateral or double.

This single elliptic geometry is never mentioned in Barbarin's book; just as the Riemannian is never mentioned in Manning's book. First take your choice, then buy your non-Euclidean geometry.

On p. 36, Barbarin gives to Gauss the honor which belongs to Wallis of being the first to remark that the existence of unequal similar figures is equivalent, in continuous space, to the parallel postulate.

In Chapter VII, 'Les Contradicteurs de la géométrie non Euclidienne,' Professor Barbarin makes with unanswerable vigor the argument which I gave in my 'Report on Progress in Non-Euclidean Geometry,' (*Science*, N. S., Vol. X, pp. 545-557). There I quoted Whitehead, who was the first to publish (March 10, 1898) "the extension of Bolyai's theorem by investigating the properties of the general class of surfaces in any non-Euclidean space, elliptic or hyperbolic, which are such that their geodesic geometry is that of straight lines in a Euclidean plane. "Such surfaces are proved to be real in elliptic as well as in hyperbolic space, and their general equations are found for the case when they are surfaces of revolution. In hyperbolic space, Bolyai's limit-surfaces are shown to be a particular case of such surfaces of revolution. The same principles would enable the problem to be solved of the discovery in any kind of space of surfaces with their 'geodesic' geometry identical with that of planes in any other kind of space."

Now not only the strikingly important problem solved by Whitehead, but also the analogous problem indicated, had both been solved by Barbarin and presented three months before to the Académie Royale de Belgique; but these investigations were only published after the appearance of my Report (October 20, 1899). They, as Barbarin says, p. 63, 'bring out in a striking manner the absolute independence of the three systems of geometry, which are able each to get everything from its own resources without need of borrowing anything from the others.' In each of the three spaces, Euclidean, Bolyaian, Riemannian, there exist surfaces whose geodesics have the metric properties of the straights of the two other spaces.

But the book in which these beautiful researches are published: 'Etudes de géométrie analytique non euclidienne par P. Barbarin, Bruxelles,' 1900, Hayez, pp. 168, has other titles to universal recognition.

Notwithstanding the ever-present example of Euclid, who never uses a construction or a figure which he has not introduced as following deductively from his two postulated figures, the straight and the circle, an insidious error crept into geometry, taught by Beman and Smith in the following words: (See their 'Geometry,' 1899, p. 70, § 112, or the AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL MONTHLY, Vol. IX, p. 131.)

"*Note on Assumed Constructions.* It has been assumed, up to prop. XXVIII, that all constructions were made as required for the theorems. Thus an equilateral triangle has been frequently mentioned, although the method of constructing one has not yet been indicated; a regular heptagon has been mentioned in ex. 93, and reference might be made to certain results following from the trisection of an angle, although the solutions of the problems, to construct a regular heptagon, and to trisect any angle, are impossible by elementary geometry. But the possibility of solving such problems has nothing to do with the logical sequence of the theorems."

This is a fundamental error. Thus for example, to construct an equilateral triangle on a given sect ['line segment,' they say,] requires and presumes the following lemma: "If A and B be any two given points, there is at least one point C whose sects from A and B are both congruent to the sect AB." This requires for its deduction a continuity assumption, such as that of Dedekind, Weierstrass, or Archimedes. But this totally changes the whole sequence of theorems. Hilbert establishes Euclidean geometry without any such assumption. His assumption of this construction would shatter his whole edifice. Moreover the fact that, even with a continuity assumption, in elliptic space it is not always, even then, possible to construct an equilateral triangle on a given base, shows that the assumption involves also the previous assumption that the straight line is not finite or closed, which again involves the betweenness assumptions so brilliantly reduced from five to four in the April number of the AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL MONTHLY, again involving the whole logical sequence of the theorems.

The construction so glibly assumed, to pass a circle through any three non-co-straight points, is equivalent to the assumption of the world-renowned parallel-postulate, and thus has everything in the world to do with the sequence of the theorems. The assumed construction of a triangle from three sects which are to be its sides, by the method of Beman and Smith, p. 76, is equivalent to the assumption of the Archimedes postulate, which again has everything to do with the logical sequence of the theorems. In fact just this assumption makes ephemeral the beautiful method of Saccheri used in the book we are reviewing.

Hence we can appreciate that astounding achievement of Bolyai's young genius, his § 34, where he solves for his universe, Eu., I, 31, To draw a straight line through a given point parallel to a given straight line. His brilliant lead was followed more than half a century later by Gerard, but it is Barbarin who has ended the matter by deducing from certain very simple constructions of the trirectangular quadrilateral all the fundamental plane constructions.

In chapter VIII ('La géométrie physique,' § 30, 'La forme géométrique de notre univers') our author stresses the idea, that even if our universe were exactly Euclidean, it would be forever impossible for us to demonstrate this. As I said in my 'Non-Euclidean Geometry for Teachers,' p. 14: "If in the mechanics of the world independent of man we were absolutely certain that all therein is Euclidean and only Euclidean, then Darwinism would be disproved by the *reductio ad absurdum*. All our measurements are finite and approximate only. The mechanics of actual bodies in what Cayley called the external space of our experience, might conceivably be shown by merely approximate measurements to be non-Euclidean, just as a body might be shown to weigh more than two grams or less than two grams, though it never could be shown to weigh precisely, absolutely two grams."

Our author suggests the following experiment for proving our space non-Euclidean: From a point trace six rays sixty degrees apart. On them successively mark off the sects OA_0 , OA_1 , OA_2 , ..., OA_n , of which each is the projection of the following. If we finish by finding between OA_n and $2^{\circ}OA_0$ a difference of constant sense and greater than imputable to error of procedure, our universe is non-Euclidean.

In conclusion this beautiful little book has the advantage of being the production of an active and fertile original worker in the domain of which it treats. His 'Géométrie general des espaces' (1898), his 'Sur le paramètre de l'univers,' and 'Sur la géométrie des êtres plans' (1901), 'Le cinquième livre de la métageométrie,' (1901), 'Les cosegments et les volumes en géométrie non euclidienne' (1902), and his 'Poligones réguliers spheriques et non-euclidiens,' shortly to appear in that virile young monthly, *Le Matematiche*, and which I had the advantage of reading in manuscript, show that Bordeaux is honored by a worthy successor of Houël, so universally beloved.

DEPARTMENTS.

SOLUTIONS OF PROBLEMS.

ARITHMETIC.

Remark on Problem No. 154. by G. B. M. Zerr.

According to the correction made in the April number, the result in the second solution is 17. This result is not correct. The problem as stated is not possible. It takes 12 oxen to eat the growing grass. Then $17 - 12 = 5$ oxen remaining to eat the grass already grown.

Now 9 oxen eat the standing grass in 6 weeks or 1 ox eats it in 54 weeks.

∴ 5 oxen will eat it in $54 \div 5 = 10\frac{4}{5}$ weeks.

∴ 17 oxen will eat it, the grass, together with what grows, in $10\frac{4}{5}$ weeks.